

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_93643
Title of the Manuscript:	FALLING STANDARD OF PARENTING IN THE 21ST CENTURY: THE WAY FORWARD
Type of the Article	Original Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article has scientific importance, however some observations are necessary. the authors refuse to discuss the diversity of composition of the modern family (since they refer to the 21st century). Considering a family as being composed of a father, mother and children is dangerous, biased and a scientific lack in the face of the facts. Despite reporting family compositions of single mothers, it does not cite single fathers. At no time do the authors address the reality of LGBTQIA+ families. If the authors' intention is to deal only with the family within a traditional and conservative concept, it is necessary to make this clear in the manuscript. Otherwise it looks like there is only one form of family.</p> <p>Although religious manifestation is free, and so it should be in the democratic regime. Including this discourse in a scientific article does not obey fundamental principles of science. Replicability, impartiality and the contradictory. Religious discourse is endowed with dogmas that by definition go against the pillars of science.</p> <p>When the authors point out the God factor in the way forward with regard to the weaknesses found in the exercise of parenting, they compromise the study and exclude all non-Christian families. Authors need to make it clear in the manuscript that this is an article written for a specific audience, that the results found do not apply to everyone and that the proposed model is not universal, but inherent to a very specific reality, a very specific audience.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>In summary of the comments made, I make it clear my concern with the practice of pseudoscience. Where articles covered in scientific language, with scientific metrics and using the public faith that science has conquered spread retrograde ideas or to spread religious values. Authors need to understand that a scientific article cannot be used to spread their own ideas, religious or cultural values. The scientific article must report the phenomenon, as it occurred, without a trial. Must possess immaculate language of prejudice. And most importantly, the article must report all aspects of the phenomenon, regardless of whether it goes against the writer's values.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	João Ronaldo Tavares de Vasconcelos Neto
Department, University & Country	Unidade de Ensino Superior de Feira de Santana, Brasil